

this year. Somebody ought to take and read what it says. It is on matters not before the Legislature but it seems halfway through closings at the end of debate just anytime it happens to trip the trigger of some individuals they bop up and say "personal privilege", give a speech on the issue laying an invective against some individual or other who they happen to be hot at at the time and I think that is not what personal privilege is all about and I would suggest the Chair now and in the future read the rules and start applying the point of personal privilege more appropriately. And I don't think, as I say, I should be condemned forever because I point out that there are Republicans and Democrats in here and sometimes we vote along party lines. Shocking as that seems to some of you, it does occur. In fact, I have a confession to make. I even do it. That is right. Sometimes I vote along strict party lines when the Republican Party has a particular position on a thing and I think that position is reasonable. May have misgivings about the whole program but we vote along party lines. Look the amendment over. As I say, it is simple. Next year, July 1, 1984, 6%; July 1, 1985, 5%; July 1, 1986, another 5%. I think it would take it out of the realm of politics for about three years until after the next Governor's race and, indeed, sure, somebody could come in and change it but they would have to pass a special bill to do it and it would pretty well set out where we were. I thought about withdrawing the amendment but in view of the fact that we have talked about it long enough now, the other ones, I would just say vote it up or down, I don't care.

SENATOR LANDIS: Senator Warner, for five minutes.

SENATOR WARNER: Mr. President, members of the Legislature, I just merely want to point out that the proposed amendment does nothing. This is an appropriation bill. The proposal as filed merely is intent language. Some of you here will recall the intent language that LB 1 had which doesn't appear anywhere. The Attorney General's opinion that says when you try to do substantive legislation in an appropriation bill that it merely is advisory, therefore, it would have no impact. Secondly, I would say there is a bill on General File that in fact does the kind of thing that Senator DeCamp is talking about that could be taken up in January if you want to guarantee adjustments. I have some reservations about it even though it is my own bill but the concept is there and is available if that is the proper route to go. And, finally, even if you thought it was constitutional, then you are locking yourself in, supposedly for three years which would seem to me to be even more hazardous than a fund that you could appropriate next time